

The sine-Gordon model and the small k^+ region of light-cone perturbation theory[†]

Paul A. Griffin^{††}

Department of Physics, University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Abstract

The non-perturbative ultraviolet divergence of the sine-Gordon model is used to study the $k^+ = 0$ region of light-cone perturbation theory. The light-cone vacuum is shown to be unstable at the non-perturbative $\beta^2 = 8\pi$ critical point by a light-cone version of Coleman's variational method. Vacuum bubbles, which are $k^+ = 0$ diagrams in light-cone field theory and are individually finite and non-vanishing for all β , conspire to generate ultraviolet divergences of the light-cone energy density. The $k^+ = 0$ region of momentum also contributes to connected Green's functions; the connected two point function will not diverge, as it should, at the critical point unless diagrams which contribute only at $k^+ = 0$ are properly included. This analysis shows in a simple way how the $k^+ = 0$ region cannot be ignored even for connected diagrams. This phenomenon is expected to occur in higher dimensional gauge theories starting at two loop order in light-cone perturbation theory.

[†] Supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, under grant DE-FG05-86ER-40272

^{††} Internet: pgriffin@ufhepa.phys.ufl.edu

1. Introduction

Recently, much attention has been given to the issue of regulating the non-covariant divergences which occur in canonical light-cone field theory[1][2][3][4]. In the naive application of this perturbation theory, the $k^+ = 0$ region of light-cone Feynman diagrams is regulated by applying a cutoff to $k^+ \sim \epsilon$ to momentum integrals. It is then assumed that for physical (gauge invariant) processes the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit can be taken at the end of the full calculation, i.e. the $k^+ = 0$ region does not contribute to physical processes. This assumption is analogous to the (in this case correct) expectation that infrared (IR) divergences cancel in inclusive processes for theories with massless particles. In fact, a straight cutoff of the $k^+ = 0$ region does give the right renormalization structure at one loop for QED[4] and the right beta function $\beta(g)$ for QCD[5]. Furthermore, it is standard lore that the light-cone vacuum is trivial; i.e. that the interacting vacuum is the free-field vacuum. In light-cone perturbation theory this implies that all bubble diagrams, which have support only in the $k^+ = 0$ region, actually vanish; certainly with a sharp k^+ cutoff they can not contribute. However, that the light-cone vacuum actually must be non-trivial has been discussed recently in refs. [6][7][8], and in fact was actually realized many years ago[9].

In this letter, the sine-Gordon model in two dimensions will be used to explore these questions. We will see that vacuum bubbles do not vanish, and (more importantly) that the $k^+ = 0$ region of light-cone perturbation theory contributes to connected Green's functions at second order in the light-cone Hamiltonian perturbation theory; these facts are intimately related. For the more physical gauge theories in four dimensions, it will be clear that the $k^+ = 0$ region can contribute to connected Green's functions at two-loop order and beyond.

The analysis of this paper is in the framework of canonical quantization on the light-cone (null plane) $x^+ = (t+x)/\sqrt{2} = 0$, and Dyson's (old fashioned) Hamiltonian perturbation theory for the light-cone[10][11][12]. While the issue addressed here is not the same as the $k^+ = 0$ divergence in the covariant Minkowski-space Feynman perturbation theory of gauge theories in the light-cone gauge, which is treated with the Mandelstam-Leibbrandt prescription[13][14], they are probably deeply related.

Note that no new properties will be discovered about the sine-Gordon model per se, and only sine-Gordon perturbation theory[15][16][17][18] will be discussed. (The exact sine-Gordon solution via the inverse scattering method is given in ref. [19].) The reason for using this model is that the $k^+ = 0$ issue appears to lowest non-vanishing order in sine-Gordon perturbation theory, and is easy to calculate because the sine-Gordon model is

ultraviolet (UV) finite diagram by diagram[15]. In addition, we will use existence of the phase transition at $\beta^2 = 8\pi$ as a check on the validity of light-cone perturbation theory.

2. The instability at $\beta^2 = 8\pi$

To warm up, let us calculate the critical point of the sine-Gordon model using Coleman's variation method[15] and light-cone quantization. This will lead to insight on the nature (IR versus ultraviolet UV) of the $k^+ = 0$ singularity. In particular, we want to show that for $\beta^2 \geq 8\pi$, the Hamiltonian density $\mathcal{H}$ is unbounded from below.

For canonical light-cone quantization on the null-plane, the momentum operator is $P^+ = \int dx^- (\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{P})/\sqrt{2}$ and the Hamiltonian operator is $P^- = \int dx^- (\mathcal{H} - \mathcal{P})/\sqrt{2}$. For the sine-Gordon model, they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P^+ &= \int dx^- \partial_- \phi \partial_- \phi , \\ P^- &= \int dx^- \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta^2} (1 - \cos \beta \phi) , \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where α_0 and β are taken to be positive[15]. If we expand about the configuration of minimum P^- , ($\phi = 0$), then $1 - \cos \beta \phi$ is an even power series in ϕ ; the quadratic term has coefficient $\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2}m^2$, where m is mass associated with perturbation theory about $\phi = 0$. The canonical boson field has mode expansion at $x^+ = 0$

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \int_0^\infty \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \left[a(k^+) e^{-ik^+ x^-} + a^\dagger(k^+) e^{+ik^+ x^-} \right] , \tag{2.2}$$

where the $1/k^+$ term in the integrand of eqn. (2.2) comes from the covariant measure for free particles. The canonical commutation relations are

$$[a(k^+), a^\dagger(k'^+)] = k^+ \delta(k^+ - k'^+) . \tag{2.3}$$

In terms of the creation $a^\dagger$ and annihilation a operators, the light-cone momentum density operator is

$$N_m[\partial_- \phi \partial_- \phi] + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^\infty dk^+ k^+ , \tag{2.4}$$

where normal ordering $N_m[]$ is with respect to the free-field vacuum with mass m . In order to perform a variational calculation of the Hamiltonian density with respect a new vacuum state $|\mu\rangle$ that corresponds to different free-field mass μ , it necessary to calculate the divergent part of eqn. (2.4) with respect to a UV momentum cutoff[15].

To this end, introduce “IR” and “UV” cutoffs δ^+ and Λ^+ ,

$$\int_0^\infty dk^+ \rightarrow \int_{\delta^+}^{\Lambda^+} dk^+ . \quad (2.5)$$

These cutoffs are actually related by parity. Consider the solution to the free-field equation of motion,

$$\phi = \int_{\delta^+}^{\Lambda^+} \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \left[b(k^+) e^{+ik^+x^-} e^{+m^2x^+/2k^+} + \text{c.c.} \right] . \quad (2.6)$$

Under parity $x \rightarrow -x$, the modes b transform as $b(k^+) \rightarrow b(m^2/2k^+)$, and the cutoffs transform as $\Lambda^+ \rightarrow m^2/2\delta^+$ and $\delta^+ \rightarrow m^2/2\Lambda^+$. Hence to maintain parity with our regularization of the divergent part of P^+ , let

$$\delta^+ = \frac{m^2}{2\Lambda^+} . \quad (2.7)$$

This relation introduces the mass m into the divergent part of P^+ . The regulated free-field light-cone vacuum is therefore sensitive to the free-field mass. And note that the $k^+ = 0$ region is clearly not just IR, since parity interchanges the IR region with the UV region of k^+ . The UV cutoff Λ^+ is by Lorentz invariance a function of the free-field mass and a mass-independent momentum cutoff Λ ,

$$\Lambda^+ = \frac{\Lambda + \sqrt{\Lambda^2 + m^2}}{\sqrt{2}} . \quad (2.8)$$

Using relations (2.7) and (2.8), the regulated light-cone momentum is

$$P^+ = N_m[P^+] + \frac{1}{8\pi} [2\Lambda^2 + m^2 + \mathcal{O}(m/\Lambda)] . \quad (2.9)$$

To similarly regularize the light-cone energy density, relate the exponentials in the $\cos \beta\phi$ term to their normal ordered forms:

$$e^{\pm i\beta\phi} = e^{\pm i\beta\phi^+} e^{\pm i\beta\phi^-} e^{\beta^2[\phi^+, \phi^-]/2} = N_m[e^{\pm i\beta\phi}] \left(\frac{m^2}{4\Lambda^2} \right)^{\frac{\beta^2}{8\pi}} (1 + \mathcal{O}(m/\Lambda)) , \quad (2.10)$$

where ϕ^+ and ϕ^- contain only raising and lowering operators respectively.

With eqns. (2.9) and (2.10), we can easily reproduce the variational estimate of Coleman. In the quantum perturbation theory with respect to the mass m vacuum state, the correct expression for the Hamiltonian density is

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} N_m [\partial_- \phi \partial_- \phi + \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} (1 - \cos \beta\phi)] . \quad (2.11)$$

Normal ordering the exponential eliminates divergent tadpole terms, and renormalizes the coupling constant $\alpha_0 \rightarrow \alpha$. The resulting perturbation theory is UV finite, diagram by diagram[15]. Now consider the variational estimate of the energy density with respect to the perturbative ground states corresponding to free-field mass μ . Using eqns. (2.9) and (2.10),

$$\langle \mu | \mathcal{H} | \mu \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{8\pi} (\mu^2 - m^2) - \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right)^{\frac{\beta^2}{8\pi}} \right], \quad (2.12)$$

where the cutoff $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$. For finite α and $\beta > 8\pi$ the energy density of the μ vacuum state is unbounded from below as μ becomes large, and the theory as defined has no ground state for these values of β .

The underlying reason that the sine-Gordon perturbation theory is sick for $\beta^2 > 8\pi$ is based on the fact that the anomalous dimension of the cosine term is $\beta^2/4\pi$. For $\beta^2 < 8\pi$ the anomalous dimension of the interaction Hamiltonian is less than two and the theory is super-renormalizable, at $\beta^2 = 8\pi$ the cosine term is a marginal operator and the theory is renormalizable[18][20], and for $\beta^2 > 8\pi$ the anomalous dimension is greater than 2, the dimension of the renormalized coupling α is negative, and the theory is non-renormalizable.

3. The light-cone vacuum is non-trivial

We will now try to understand the UV divergence for $\beta^2 \geq 8\pi$ diagrammatically in light-cone perturbation theory. We proved in the previous section that the light-cone vacuum is unstable in this regime. This is possible only if vacuum bubbles are non-vanishing, and the interacting light-cone vacuum is not the free-field light-cone vacuum. As we will explicitly see, vacuum bubbles in light-cone field theory are $k^+ = 0$ diagrams, and the sharp cutoff of the $k^+ = 0$ region used in variational estimate of the previous section is not a suitable regulator for these diagrams.

The light-cone Hamiltonian density is broken up into free and interacting parts,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{free}}^- &= \frac{1}{2} m^2 \int dx^- N[\phi^2], \\ P_{\text{int}}^- &= \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2} \int dx^- N[(1 - \cos \beta \phi + \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \phi^2)], \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $m^2 = \alpha$, and the normal ordering is with respect to m . The Dyson perturbation expansion is defined for operators in the interaction representation, $\mathcal{O}(x^-, x^+) =$

$e^{iP_{\text{free}}^- x^+} \mathcal{O}(x^-) e^{-iP_{\text{free}}^- x^+}$. In particular, the free-field Green's function is $G(x, x') = \langle 0 | T[\phi(x^-, x^+) \phi(x'^-, x'^+)] | 0 \rangle$, where the time ordering $T[]$ is with respect to the light-cone time x^+ :

$$G(x) = \frac{\Theta(+x^+)}{4\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{dk^+}{k^+} e^{-i[k^+ x^- + m^2 x^+ / 2k^+]} + \frac{\Theta(-x^+)}{4\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{dk^+}{k^+} e^{+i[k^+ x^- + m^2 x^+ / 2k^+]} . \quad (3.2)$$

The integrals over k^+ are well defined because the singularity at $k^+ = 0$ is cancelled by the $k^+ = \infty$ region. The result is just the covariant propagator for both time-like and space-like separations. The one explicit property of $G(x)$ that is required in the following analysis is that for $|x|m \ll 1$, where $|x|$ is the invariant distance, the Green's function is $G(x) = -\ln[m^2 x^2]/4\pi$. A standard tool from light-cone perturbation theory that will be applied is Wick's theorem for x^+ -ordered exponentials,

$$T[e^{i \int d^2 x j(x) \phi(x)}] = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int d^2 x d^2 y j(x) j(y) G(x-y)} N[e^{i \int d^2 x j(x) \phi(x)}] . \quad (3.3)$$

The interacting vacuum light-cone energy density $\mathcal{E}^-$ is given by a straightforward rewriting of the Gell-Mann Low equal time formula[21] for the light-cone case,

$$\mathcal{E}^- = \langle 0 | \mathcal{P}_{\text{int}}^-(0) T \left[\exp \left(-i \int_{-\infty}^0 dx^+ \mathcal{P}_{\text{int}}^- \right) \right] | 0 \rangle_{\text{conn}} , \quad (3.4)$$

where $\langle 0 | \dots | 0 \rangle_{\text{conn}}$ is the connected (to the light-cone Hamiltonian density $\mathcal{P}_{\text{int}}^-(0)$) free-field vacuum expectation value. This expression is a perturbation theory in α . To first order in α , $\mathcal{E}_1^- = \langle 0 | P_{\text{int}}^-(0) | 0 \rangle = 0$; but to order α^2 , we get the non-vanishing result

$$\mathcal{E}_2^- = -i \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^4} \int_{-\infty}^0 dx^+ \int_{-\infty}^\infty dx^- [\cosh(\beta^2 G(x)) - \beta^4 G^2(x) - 1] . \quad (3.5)$$

To recover the light-cone perturbation theory expression for $\mathcal{E}_2^-$, expand eqn. (3.5) in a power series in β , and integrate over coordinates x^+ and x^- . Using eqn. (3.2), one easily finds

$$\mathcal{E}_2^- = -\frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^4} \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{\beta^{2n}}{(2n)!} \int_0^\infty \prod_{p=1}^n \frac{dk_p^+}{k_p^+} \frac{\delta(\sum_{q=1}^n k_q^+)}{\sum_{r=1}^n \frac{m^2}{2k_r^+} - i\epsilon} . \quad (3.6)$$

This power series expansion in β has the diagrammatic interpretation shown in figure 1. It is an infinite sum of two-point connected vacuum bubbles, which are non-vanishing only in the $k^+ \rightarrow 0$ limit. Because of the ratio $\delta(\sum k^+)/\prod k^+$, this limit is ill-defined; regulating the $k^+ = 0$ region by introducing a cutoff $k^+ \geq \delta^+$ would miss this contribution

altogether. How one should properly evaluate these integrals is no mystery however, since the coordinate space representation given by eqn. (3.5) is perfectly well defined.

To see that eqns. (3.5) and (3.6) must be non-vanishing, consider the non-perturbative UV divergence of the sine-Gordon model. The divergence occurs when the point separation $|x|$ is very small, i.e. close to the light-cone, where the most singular term in the light-cone operator product expansion of the interacting light-cone Hamiltonian densities will contribute. The divergence is regulated by introducing a spatial UV cutoff a^2 , where $ma \ll 1$, and letting $G(m^2x^2) \rightarrow G(m^2(x^2 + a^2))$. Then the most singular part of eqn. (3.5), comes from the exponential $\exp \beta^2 G(x) \approx \exp[-\ln m^2(x^2 + a^2)/4\pi]$. The singular term is isolated by restricting the d^2x integral to the region $x^2 < l^2$, where $ml \ll 1$ and $l > a$,

$$-i \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta^4} \int_{-\infty}^0 dx^+ \int_{x^2 < l^2} dx^- [m^2(x^2 + a^2)]^{\frac{-\beta^2}{4\pi}}. \quad (3.7)$$

This expression differs from the equal-time result[16][17] in that the space-time integral is over regions with $x^+ < 0$, verses regions with $t < 0$ in the equal-time case. One might therefore worry that there might be a cancellation between space-like and time-like regions for the light-cone field theory case. The space-like region for $x^+ < 0$ is $x^- > 0$, and it can be parametrized as $x^- = -re^{+\theta}$ and $x^+ = -re^{-\theta}$. The measure is just $\int_0^{l/\sqrt{2}} r dr \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\theta$. Similarly for the time-like region $x^- < 0$, the parametrization is $x^- = -re^{+\theta}$ and $x^+ = -re^{-\theta}$, and the measure is the exactly the same as the space-like region. The Green's functions are independent of θ , and the space-like and time-like contributions add. The light-cone result is the same as the equal-time result; isolating the a dependence of eqn. (3.7),

$$\mathcal{E}_2^- \sim -i \frac{\alpha^{2(1-\frac{\beta^2}{4\pi})}}{\beta^4} \int d\theta \frac{a^{2(1-\frac{\beta^2}{4\pi})}}{(1-\beta^2/4\pi)}. \quad (3.8)$$

This result is valid for all $\beta^2 \neq 4\pi$. As $a \rightarrow 0$, the expression vanishes for $\beta^2 < 4\pi$, and has a power-law divergence for $\beta^2 > 4\pi$. At $\beta^2 = 4\pi$, the a dependence is really $\ln a$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}_2^-$ diverges logarithmically as $a \rightarrow 0$. Note that this logarithmic divergence does *not* occur at the phase transition point $\beta^2 = 8\pi$. And according to ref. [17], the $2p$ point contribution in the equal time-case diverges logarithmically at $\beta^2/8\pi = 1 - (2p)^{-1}$ and the odd p -point functions are UV finite for all $\beta^2 < 8\pi$. For $\beta^2 < 8\pi$, the divergences are less severe as p increases; for $\beta^2 \geq 8\pi$ they become worse, and in this sense perturbation theory breaks down.

It is clear from the above analysis that vacuum bubbles in light-cone field theory, which correspond to the $k^+ = 0$ region of momentum space, are in general non-vanishing. And one proper way of evaluating them is to use the coordinate space diagram approach, which follows directly from the Dyson expansion in perturbation theory.

4. The $k^+ = 0$ contribution to the Feynman propagator

The vacuum energy density is not a physical observable for the sine-Gordon model (no gravity) so its singularity properties are a relatively mild concern. What is more important are singularities in physical connected Green's functions, which from the equal-time analysis[17][18], occur only at $\beta^2 = 8\pi$. To study this we will calculate to second order the in light-cone perturbation theory the connected two-point Green's function (the Feynman propagator) $\Gamma^{(2)}(k)$,

$$\Gamma^{(2)}(k) = \int d^2x e^{ik \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \left[\phi(x) \phi(0) \exp \left(-i \int dx^+ P_{\text{int}}^- \right) \right] | 0 \rangle_{\text{conn}} . \quad (4.1)$$

The leading order contribution $\Gamma_0^{(2)}$ is $\int d^2x e^{ik \cdot x} G(x) = G_0(k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(k) &= \frac{i\Theta(k^+)}{2k^+ [k^- - m^2/(2k^+) + i\epsilon]} + \frac{i\Theta(-k^+)}{2k^+ [k^- - m^2/(2k^+) - i\epsilon]} \\ &= \frac{i}{[k^+ k^- - m^2/2 + i\epsilon]} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

The next non-vanishing term is order α^2 . The simplest way to calculate it is to temporarily exponentiate $\phi(x)\phi(0)$ to $\exp(a\phi(x))\exp(b\phi(x))$, use eqn. (3.3), and then pick out the order ab terms;

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2^{(2)}(k) &= G_0^2(k) \frac{4\alpha^2}{\beta^4} \int d^2x \left\{ [\cosh(\beta^2 G(x)) - \beta^4 G^2(x) - 1] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - e^{-ik \cdot x} [\sinh(\beta^2 G(x)) - \beta^2 G(x)] \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

This equation is manifestly covariant and equivalent to the equal-time result[17].

Now we can interpret it in terms of light-cone diagrams. After integrating over x^- , the $[\cosh \dots]$ term of eqn. (4.3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_0^2(k) \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta^4} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^{2n}}{(2n)!} \int_0^{\infty} \prod_{p=1}^n \frac{dk_p^+}{k_p^+} \delta\left(\sum_{q=1}^n k_q^+\right) \\ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx^+ \left\{ \Theta(-x^+) e^{ix^+ \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{m^2}{2k_r^+}} + \Theta(x^+) e^{-ix^+ \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{m^2}{2k_r^+}} \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

These are “connected bubble” diagrams as shown in figure 2a-b. Integrating over x^+ will generate $1/(P_0^- - i\epsilon)$ denominators. Like the true vacuum bubble diagrams of eqn.

(3.6) and fig. 1, they receive support only in the $k^+ = 0$ region of light-cone momentum. Similarly, the $[\sinh \dots]$ term of eqn. (4.3) has the light-cone momentum space expansion

$$G_0^2(k) \frac{\alpha^2}{2\beta^4} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^{2n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \int_0^{\infty} \prod_{p=1}^n \frac{dk_p^+}{k_p^+} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx^+ \left\{ \Theta(-x^+) \delta(k^+ - \sum_{q=1}^n k_q^+) e^{-ix^+ \left(k^- - \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{m^2}{2k_r^+} \right)} + \Theta(x^+) \delta(k^+ + \sum_{q=1}^n k_q^+) e^{-ix^+ \left(k^- + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{m^2}{2k_r^+} \right)} \right\}. \quad (4.5)$$

The $\Theta(x^+) \dots$ term of this expression are the “Z”-diagrams of fig. 3b. They vanish for all physical (i.e. particles moving forward in time) momenta $k^+ > 0$, because of the constraint $\delta(k^+ + \sum_p k_p^+)$. The regular light-cone diagrams of fig. 3a contain a contribution from the $k^+ = 0$ region of each internal momentum, since like the bubble diagrams, their denominators are singular when $\prod_p k_p^+ (\sum_r m^2/2k_r^+ - k^-)$ vanishes. The singularity occurs when two internal light-cone momenta simultaneously vanish while the constraint $\sum_q k_q^+ = k^+$ is still preserved. (Note that this is impossible for ϕ^3 theory[9].) Therefore both the connected bubble diagrams of fig. 2a-b and the regular light-cone diagrams of fig. 3a have contributions from the $k^+ = 0$ region. These contributions do not cancel between the two types of diagrams, because they occur to different orders in β perturbation theory. The connected bubble diagrams are even order in β , while the regular diagrams are odd order.

We can verify the assertion that the connected bubble diagrams of fig. 2a-b contribute to the connected Green’s function $\Gamma_2^{(2)}$ by considering the non-perturbative UV divergence of the sine-Gordon model that arises from integrating over the small $|x|$ region of eqn. (4.3). Separately, the sum of connected bubble diagrams of fig. 2 and the sum of the diagrams of fig. 3a diverge at $\beta^2 = 4\pi$. This is easy to see; the sources of the divergence are the $e^{\beta^2 G(x)}$ terms in eqn. (4.3), and the result follows from the analysis for the true bubble diagrams of eqn. (3.6). However, when the terms are combined and the net divergence of eqn. (4.3) is considered, the result for the regulated contribution from the small $|x|$ region is

$$\Gamma_2^{(2)}(k) = G_0^2(k) \sim \frac{\alpha^{2(1-\frac{\beta^2}{4\pi})}}{\beta^4} |x|^2 \int d\theta \frac{a^{2(1-\frac{\beta^2}{8\pi})}}{(1 - \beta^2/8\pi)}. \quad (4.6)$$

This is valid for all $\beta^2 \neq 8\pi$; for $\beta^2 = 8\pi$ the net contribution diverges logarithmically as $a \rightarrow 0$. The important point is that without the $k^+ = 0$ contribution from the connected bubble diagrams one gets the false, and unphysical, result that the phase transition is at $\beta^2 = 4\pi$. The interplay between regular light-cone diagrams and the connected bubble diagrams that produces the correct non-perturbative (in β) UV divergence of the sine-Gordon model is expected to occur order by order in α perturbation theory[18].

5. Discussion

The light-cone vacuum of the sine-Gordon model is unstable at $\beta^2 \geq 8\pi$, by a simple application of Coleman’s variational technique to light-cone field theory. The crucial element in the light-cone analysis is that the small and large k^+ cutoffs required for the variational calculation are related by parity. This introduces free-field mass dependence into the regulated expressions of the vacuum expectation values of light-cone energy and momentum.

This momentum cutoff prescription is not a sufficient regulator of light-cone perturbation theory; the $k^+ = 0$ region of light-cone perturbation theory contributes to connected Green’s functions in sine-Gordon model perturbation theory, and incorrect results will occur if this region of momentum space is discarded. This region contributes to connected diagrams at the two-loop order. (The one loop contributions are tadpoles, which are eliminated by normal ordering.) The existence of the four and higher point vertices in the theory is crucial to have non-vanishing connected bubble diagrams and $k^+ = 0$ singularities in the regular connected diagrams; ϕ^3 theory does not have any contribution from the $k^+ = 0$ region to connected diagrams[9].

While in this paper, we focused on the effect of $k^+ = 0$ digrams on the propagator, all of the vertices that occur in the sine-Gordon model also receive contributions from $k^+ = 0$ type diagrams. Therefore, it is clear that the naive process of implementing a sharp cutoff of the $k^+ = 0$ region without making any corrections to the interaction light-cone Hamiltonian in perturbation theory is doomed to failure. With the sharp cutoff, corrections to the propagator and vertices will have to be made order by order in perturbation theory; neglecting the $k^+ = 0$ region will in general violate gauge or Lorentz symmetries, and the counterterms are necessary to restore them. It is not clear, however, that symmetry restoration provides strong enough constraints to recover a unique Hamiltonian. Therefore, the light-cone Hamiltonian with cutoff of the $k^+ = 0$ region is a phenomenological construction that needs to be tuned order by order in perturbation theory.

Symmetry restoration in “naive” light-cone perturbation theory has already been considered[2][3] by Burkardt and Langnau. In particular, in ref. [3], the non-covariant two loop term that is added to light-cone perturbation theory is a $k^+ = 0$ contribution. In their analysis, they recovered this term by starting with the covariant momentum space approach and correctly integrating over k^- . I have argued here that light-cone field theory is completely valid at the level of the Dyson perturbative expansion, and that neglecting $k^+ = 0$ diagrams when integrating over $x^\pm$ is a source of similar problems.

One may ask how these results can be applied to more physical models. Gauge theories quantized on the light-cone in light-cone gauge $A_- = 0$ have an effective four point Fermi coupling which arises from the constraint equation for A_+ [10]. Because of its non-local nature, the vertex carries an extra $1/(k^+)^2$. Therefore for QED as well as QCD, a potential contribution from the $k^+ = 0$ region via the connected bubble type diagrams exists starting at two loop order.

We have noted that the coordinate space expression for the light-cone vacuum energy density that comes directly from the Dyson perturbative expansion is perfectly well defined diagram by diagram, while the “equivalent” momentum space expression suffers from $k^+ = 0$ singularities. The mathematical source of this disparity is the integral over x^- that generates the constraint $\delta(\sum k^+)$. It might be worthwhile to try to regulate this distribution, and therefore alter the light-cone vertices, so as to make bubble diagrams well defined in momentum space light-cone field theory.

In principle, it might also be possible to build a sharp k^+ cutoff into the theory at the Lagrangian level. This is the approach suggested in ref. [1] in the context of discrete light cone quantization[22]. It would be interesting to study how this approach can recover the $k^+ = 0$ region of regular light-cone perturbation theory.

Acknowledgements: This analysis was partially motivated by discussions with M. Burkardt on Lorentz non-covariant counterterms in light-cone perturbation theory. I would also like to thank D. Robertson for explaining the results of ref. [1] to me, and C. Thorn for many useful comments regarding light-cone field theory.

Note added: K. Hornbostel has brought to my attention ref. [23], in which the variational technique of sec. 2 is applied to ϕ^4 theory in two dimensions. Their analysis uses a light-cone momentum regularization scheme which, in the limit of infinite cutoff Λ , reduces to the parity symmetric prescription advocated here.

References

- [1] G. McCartor and D. Robertson, Z. Phys. C53 (1992)679.
- [2] M. Burkardt and A. Langnau, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991)1187.
- [3] M. Burkardt and A. Langnau, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991)3857.
- [4] D. Mustaki, S. Pinsky, J. Shigemitsu,
K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D43 (1991)3411.
- [5] C. Thorn, Phys. Rev. D20 (1979)1934.
- [6] K. Hornbostel, Phys. Rev. D45 (1992)3781.
- [7] F. Lenz, S. Levit, M. Thies, and K. Yazaki, Ann. Phys. 208 (1990)1.
- [8] E. Prokvatilov and V. Franke, Yad. Fiz. 49 (1989)1109.
- [9] S. Chang and S. Ma, Phys. Rev. 180 (1969)1506.
- [10] J. Kogut and D. Soper, Phys. Rev. D1 (1970)2901.
- [11] J.D. Bjorken, J. Kogut, and D. Soper, Phys. Rev. D3 (1971)1382.
- [12] S. Chang, R. Root, and T. Yan, Phys. Rev. D7 (1973)1133,1147.
- [13] S. Mandelstam, Nucl. Phys. B213 (1983)149.
- [14] G. Leibbrandt, Phys. Rev. D29 (1984)1699.
- [15] S. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D11 (1975)2088.
- [16] S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D18 (1978)1916.
- [17] P. Minnhagen, A. Rosengren, and G. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. B18(1978)1356.
- [18] D. Amit, Y. Goldschmidt, and G. Grinstein, J. Phys. A13 (1980)585.
- [19] E. Sklyanin, L. Takhtadzhyan, and L. Faddeev, Teor. Mat. Fiz. 40 (1979)194.
- [20] V.A. Miransky, Nuovo Cimento 90A (1985)149.
- [21] M. Gell-Mann, and F. Low, Phys. Rev. 84(1951)350.
- [22] S. Brodsky and H.C. Pauli, Phys. Rev. D32 (1985)1993.
- [23] A. Harindranath and J. Vary, Phys. Rev. D37 (1988)3010.